

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action of March 13, 2006, Applicant has amended the claims, which when considered with the following remarks, is deemed to place the present application in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested. The amendments to the claims have been made in the interest of expediting prosecution of this case. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the same or similar subject matter in this or another application.

By this Amendment, Claims 1, 6, 7, 29 and 38 have been cancelled without prejudice. Applicant reserves the right to file one or more applications based on the cancelled subject matter. Accordingly, Claims 2-5, 8-10, 19-24, 26-28, 30-37 and 39 are now pending in this application.

The Examiner has allowed Claims 9, 10 and 39 over the prior art of record. By this Amendment, Claims 2-5, 8, 19-24 and 26-28 have been amended to ultimately depend from allowed Claim 9. Accordingly, amended Claims 2-5, 8, 19-24 and 26-28 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as allowed Claim 9, and immediate allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. Likewise, Claims 30-37 have been amended to ultimately depend from allowed Claim 39. Accordingly, amended Claims 30-37 are also believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as allowed Claim 39, and immediate allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added to the subject invention nor have any new issues been raised by these amendments. Accordingly, entry and consideration of the present Amendment is deemed appropriate as it places the application in condition for allowance.

Original Claims 4 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 4 and 37 have been amended to depend from allowed Claims 9 and 39 to expedite prosecution of this application. Thus, this rejection is believed to be moot.

Original Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 19-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Martin U.S. Patent No. 4,427,834 in view of In re Venner. While not necessarily agreeing with the Examiner, Claims 1, 6 and 7 have been cancelled without prejudice and Claims 2-4 and 19-24 have been amended to depend from allowed Claim 9 to expedite prosecution of this application. Thus, this rejection is deemed moot.

Original Claims 1-8 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Karll et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,384,138 in view of In re Venner. While not necessarily agreeing with the Examiner, original Claims 1, 6 and 7 have been cancelled and Claims 2-5, 8 and 28 have been amended to depend from allowed Claim 9 to expedite prosecution of this application. Thus, this rejection is deemed moot.

Original Claims 26, 27, 29 and 35-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Martin U.S. Patent No. 4, 427,834 in view of In re Venner as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Kolosov et al. U.S. Publication No. 2004/0123650. While not necessarily agreeing with the Examiner, original Claims 29 and 38 have been cancelled, Claims 26 and 27 have been amended to depend from allowed Claim 9 and Claims 35-37 have been amended to depend from allowed Claim 39 to expedite prosecution of this application. Thus, this rejection is deemed moot.

Appln. No. 10/779,424
Amdt. dated June 9, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated March 13, 2006

Original Claims 30, 31, 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Martin U.S. Patent No. 4,427,834 in view of In re Venner and Kolosov et al. U.S. Publication No. 2004/0123650 as applied to Claim 29 above, and further in view of Cohen et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,451,259. While not necessarily agreeing with the Examiner, Claims 30, 31, 33 and 34 have been amended to depend from allowed Claim 39 to expedite prosecution of this application. Thus, this rejection is deemed moot.

For the foregoing reasons, amended Claims 2-5, 8-10, 19-24, 26-28, 30-37 and 39 as presented herein are believed to be in condition for allowance. Such early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael E. Carmen
Reg. No. 43,533
Attorney for Applicant

M. CARMEN & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
170 Old Country Road – Suite 400
Mineola, NY 11501
(Phone) (516) 992-1848
(Facsimile) (516) 739-0981
MEC:bg